

between Applicant's claim 1 and the disclosure of Sonefors. In particular, Applicant's counsel pointed out that the shaving teeth 3, 4 of Sonefors each have four tooth flanks, rather than three tooth flanks as claimed by Applicant. However, the Examiner indicated that Sonefors disclosed three tooth flanks and Applicant's claim 1 was not limited to only three tooth flanks.

Applicant's counsel also pointed out that Sonefors disclosed two scratcher teeth 1, 2, between the shaving teeth 3, 4, and that therefore Sonefors did not disclose or remotely suggest that the first tooth flank of every other tooth lie in a plane, as claimed by Applicant. The Examiner agreed that Sonefors did not disclose that a tooth flank of every other tooth lay in a plane, as claimed by Applicant. Accordingly, the Examiner agreed that Sonefors was not applicable to Applicant's claimed invention, and agreed to withdraw the rejection in view of Sonefors.

Applicant also pointed out to the Examiner that the surfaces 6 of the shaving teeth 3, 4 of Sonefors did not lie in a plane, since the shaving tooth 3 was offset to one side of the blade and the shaving tooth 4 was offset to the other side of the blade (as can be seen in Figure 2 of Sonefors) and that respective surfaces 6 of the shaving teeth 3, 4 are tilted in opposite directions (as can be seen from Figure 3 of Sonefors). The Examiner did not address this argument in view of the agreement discussed above that Sonefors did not apply to Applicant's claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner agreed to withdraw the rejections contained in final Office Action and issue further action or Notice of Allowance once a written reply to the present Office Action was received.


Further remarks regarding the asserted relationship between Applicant's claims and the prior art are not deemed necessary, in view of the agreement reached during the March 13, 2007 telephone interview and the foregoing discussion. Applicant's silence as to any of the Examiner's comments is not indicative of an acquiescence to the stated grounds of rejection.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this application, allow each of the pending claims and to pass this application on to an early issue. If there are any remaining issues that need to be addressed in order to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas M. McAllister
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 37,886
Lipsitz & McAllister, LLC
755 Main Street
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 459-0200

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: HOE-764
Date: March 13, 2007